Applicants: Wolfgang Kalthoff et al.
Serial No. : 10/747,697
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 8 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13907-061001
Client Ref.: 2003P00407 US

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1 and 9 are independent.

Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

*Specification*

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to

provide proper antecedent bases for the terms "tangible machine readable medium" and

"modules" that appear in the claims. Applicants have amended the claims to replace the term

"tangible machine readable medium" with "machine readable storage device." Support for this

term is found in Applicants' specification at least on page 11, line 10. Applicants have also

amended the claims to replace the term "error correction module / modules" with "error

corrector /correctors." Applicant's specification refers to "error corrector(s)" in numerous places,

e.g., at page 10. Applicants submit that the specification provides proper antecedent basis for the

claims as amended and respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be

withdrawn.

*Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101*

The Examiner rejected claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-

statutory subject matter because, according to the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action,

"they fail to provide a tangible result, as the applicant defines a machine-readable medium to

include non-tangible mediums in the specification."

Applicants: Wolfgang Kalthoff et al.
Serial No. : 10/747,697
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 9 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13907-061001
Client Ref.: 2003P00467 US

Applicants have amended independent claim 9 to recite a "a machine readable storage device." A device, by its very definition, is a tangible object. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 101 rejections.

*Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112*

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because, according to the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, "the applicant's specification provides no [sic] support for 'error correction modules,' instead the applicant provides support for error correctors [sic], which are people."

Applicants have amended the claims to recite "error correctors" rather than "error correction modules." However, Applicants submit that the error correctors are not limited to people, and could refer to one or more processors implementing computer programs for performing the error correction steps described with respect to method shown in FIG. 3. In this regard, Applicants' specification on page 11, lines 19 to 24, explicitly state that the method steps of the invention can be performed by one or more programmable processors executing a computer program or by special purpose logic circuitry.

*Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103*

Turning to the art rejections, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rauen (U.S. Pub. 2004/0015408). Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rauen and Barr (U.S. 5182705). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater clarity. In view of these clarifications and the arguments below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the art rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants: Wolfgang Kalthoff et al.
Serial No. : 10/747,697
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 10 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13907-061001
Client Ref: 2003P00407 US

Claim 1, as amended, recites that the input data is stored in an initial data entry format and excludes information required by a data entry rule. After the data has been transformed from the data entry format to a first data storage format, the data includes the information required by the rule. An error identified in the data in the first data storage format is then corrected by either a first or second error corrector depending on the type of the error.

Unlike prior data entry approaches that require entered data to obey all data entry rules before the data can be stored, the method according to claim 1 enables data that does not adhere to a data entry rule to be stored and subsequently transformed such that the data adheres to the rule. As described in Applicant's specification on page 9, data retrieved in response to an initial request may be missing information required by one or more applicable rules. For example, the data may include the name and telephone number of a customer but lack the customer's address. Although the data may lack information required by the rules, the system enables the data to be stored and subsequently enhanced or supplemented by a data entry specialist until the data includes the information required to comply with the rules. In this regard, the method of claim 1 describes a flexible data entry approach that accepts data entered by a user, even if that user lacks complete knowledge of all of the applicable data entry rules. As described in the background of Applicants' specification, prior data entry approaches require the user who is entering the data to recognize the underlying data model of the storage system, which will not accept the data until all of the applicable rules are satisfied. The applied art is not believed to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1.

In this regard, there is nothing in Rauen that discloses or suggests "storing data input in a data entry format via an interface, wherein the data in the data entry format excludes information

required by a data entry rule" and "transforming the data from the data entry format to a first data

storage format, wherein the data in the first data storage format includes the information required

by the data entry rule." Although in paragraphs [0388] and [0708] Rauen describes translating

data from a first format to a second format, Rauen does not disclose or suggest that the data in

the first format excludes information required by a data entry rule and that the data in the second

format includes the information. Rather, according to paragraph [0388], the translating process

of Rauen (e.g., the BizTalk.TM. 230) simply translates or maps data from a first format (e.g., a

non-XML format) to a second format (e.g., an XML). There is nothing in Rauen, for example,

that discloses or suggests that the data in the second (XML) format includes information that was

not present in the first (non-XML) format.

Rauen also does not disclose or suggest storing data that excludes information required

by a data entry rule. Rather, Rauen requires data to be converted to a proper format before it is

stored in the system. For example, the passage of Rauen in paragraph [0708] describes

converting data into a format that is compatible with a server so that the data can be stored in the

server:

> Microsoft® SQL Server 2000™ can store UTF-8 data. Earlier versions of SQL
> Server use a different type of Unicode encoding called UCS-2. If a client
> employs an older version of SQL Server, an additional component may be
> needed to convert UCS-2 data to UTF-8 so it is compatible with SQL Server
> 2000.

There is nothing in the foregoing passage to indicate, for example, that the server can

store data that is not formatted as UTF-8 data. Rather, the foregoing passage suggests that the

data must be converted to a server-compatible UTF-8 format before it can be stored in the server.

Applicants : Wolfgang Kalthoff et al.                      Attorney's Docket No.: 13907-061001
Serial No. : 10/747,697                                 Client Ref.: 2003P00407 US
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 12 of 13

Barr is directed to a system for managing workflow for processing insurance claims and does not disclose anything that would remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Rauen with respect to the features of claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, independent claim 1 is believed to distinguish over the applied art. Independent claim 9 recites limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 9 is believed to distinguish over the applied art.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claims, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants : Wolfgang Kalthoff et al.
Serial No. : 10/747,697
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No : 13907-061001
Client Ref : 2003P00407 US

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

While no fees are believed to be due at this time, please apply any charge deficiencies or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 13907-061001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 2, 2007

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21604373.doc